

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 10 to 19 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the acknowledgment that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

II. Objection to the Specification

Regarding the objection to the Specification, the Abstract has been amended herein without prejudice to be less than 150 words. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Objection to Claims 11 and 17

Claims 11 and 17 were objected to for informalities. While Applicants may not agree with the merits of the objection, to facilitate matters, claims 11 and 17 have been amended without prejudice as suggested by the Office Action, thereby obviating the present objection. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. While Applicants may not agree with the merits of the rejection, to facilitate matters, claim 10 has been amended herein without prejudice in self-explanatory manner. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 10 to 14, and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 10 to 14, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,612,393 ("Bohner '393"). It is respectfully submitted that Bohner '393 does not anticipate the present claims for at least the following reasons.

To anticipate a claim, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). That is, the prior art must describe the elements arranged as required by the claims. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In other words, to be anticipatory, a single prior art reference must show all of the limitations of the claims arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claims. Net Moneyin, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc., 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Claim 10 relates to a hydraulic power steering system, including, *inter alia*, the features of a servo cylinder including a piston rod, and a rack, in which *the rack and the piston rod are adapted to act in a parallel arrangement with one another on an addition member to jointly adjust the steering angle of the wheel.*

Bohner '393 does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 10. In this regard, Bohner '393 merely describes a steering system including a normal operating system, an auxiliary operating system, and an emergency operating system, each of which is operated separately from the other systems. Col. 2, lines 26 to 44. For example, Bohner '393 states that both the auxiliary system and emergency system are shut off during normal mode, both the normal system and emergency system are shut off during transitional phase, and both the normal system and auxiliary system are shut off during emergency mode. Col. 4, lines 27 to 34; col. 5, lines 27 to 33, and 52 to 59. Moreover, Bohner '393 shows the separate operation of each system graphically in Figure 3. Col. 6, lines 40 to 51. Thus, nowhere does Bohner '393 disclose any joint adjusting of steering. Nonetheless, the Office Action at page 3 asserts that tie rod 2 constitutes an addition member. However, since Bohner '393 does not disclose any joint adjusting of steering, tie rod 2 does not constitute an addition member acted upon by a rack and a piston rod to jointly adjust steering. Moreover, Bohner '393 merely describes element 2 as a conventional tie rod 2 connected to a connecting rod 3, not an addition member to jointly adjust steering. Col. 3, lines 20 to 23. Therefore, Bohner '393 does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature that *the rack and the piston rod*

are adapted to act in a parallel arrangement with one another on an addition member to jointly adjust the steering angle of the wheel.

Accordingly, Bohner '393 does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 10. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Bohner '393 does not anticipate claim 10.

As for claims 11 to 14, and 18, which ultimately depend from and therefore include all of the features included in claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that Bohner '393 does not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bohner '393. It is respectfully submitted that Bohner '393 does not render unpatentable the presently pending claim for at least the following reasons.

Claim 19 depends from claim 10. As more fully set forth above, Bohner '393 does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 10, from which claim 19 depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Bohner '393 does not render unpatentable claim 19, which depends from claim 10.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claims 10 to 12, 14, 16, and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10 to 12, 14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,062,494 ("Okamoto et al.") and U.S. Patent No. 6,814,177 ("Bohner '177"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Okamoto et al. and Bohner '177 does not render unpatentable the presently pending claims for at least the following reasons.

In order for a claim to be rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art must teach or suggest each element of the claim. See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 111 S. Ct. 296 (1990); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In addition, as clearly indicated by the Supreme Court, it is "important to identify a reason that

would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements” in the manner claimed. See KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007). Further, the Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Claim 10 relates to a hydraulic power steering system, including, *inter alia*, the features of a servo cylinder including a piston rod, and a rack, in which *the rack and the piston rod are adapted to act in a parallel arrangement with one another on an addition member to jointly adjust the steering angle of the wheel.*

The combination of Okamoto et al. and Bohner ’177 does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 10. In this regard, Okamoto et al. merely describes a fully hydraulic steering system having a power cylinder 4 and an error correcting means. Col. 2, lines 39 to 45. In this regard, the error correcting means of Okamoto et al. includes a rack 35 connected to a directional control valve 10 for correcting a stroke error. Col. 4, lines 48 to 52; and col. 5, lines 51 to 61. The Office Action at page 5 asserts that a bracket 11a connecting directional control valve 10 and power cylinder 4 constitutes an addition member. However, Okamoto et al. states that its rack 35 includes cutout portions 35a in order to disengage pinion 34 at the end of the stroke, such that “a load is not applied to the system of steering wheel.” Col. 6, lines 3 to 8. Therefore, Okamoto et al. specifically teaches away from its rack 35 and power cylinder 4 jointly adjusting steering. Indeed, Okamoto et al. states that “[t]he present invention relates to a fully hydraulic power steering apparatus[, and] it is to be understood hereinafter that the expression ‘fully hydraulic’ means that a hydraulically operated power steering apparatus does **not** include a mechanical connection between a steering wheel and wheels to be pivoted for steering.” Col. 1, lines 7 to 18. Thus, since Okamoto et al. does not disclose any joint adjusting of steering, bracket 11a does not constitute an addition member acted upon by a rack and a piston rod to jointly adjust steering. Therefore, Okamoto et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature that *the rack and the piston rod are adapted to act in a parallel arrangement with one another on an addition member to jointly adjust the steering angle of the wheel.* Further, Bohner ’177 does not cure at least these critical deficiencies of Okamoto et al.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Okamoto et al. and Bohner ’177 does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the

features included in claim 10. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Okamoto et al. and Bohner '177 does not render unpatentable claim 10 for at least the foregoing reasons.

Thus, as for claims 11, 12, 14, 16, and 17, which ultimately depend from and therefore include all of the features included in claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Okamoto et al. and Bohner '177 does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VIII. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter included in claim 15. In this regard, the Examiner will note that claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is in condition for immediate allowance.

IX. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 4, 2010

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/
Clifford A. Ulrich
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646